



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,629	01/24/2000	Richard H. Lamb	201385	6064

7590 12/17/2003

Phillip M Pippenger
Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd
Two Prudential Plaza Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/489,629

Applicant(s)

LAMB ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10. 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-33 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Grantges, Jr. et al [Grantges 6,510,464 B1].

2. As per claim 1, Grantges discloses a method of controlling at a gateway computing device access of a client machine to a desired resource hosted on a destination server, the desired resource being of at least one material type selected from the group including audible materials, readable materials and viewable materials [Grantges, a gateway proxy server and web server, Fig 1. It was obvious the Web server provides video/audio/text services],

(a) at the gateway computing device receiving handshaking packets from the client machine intended to begin a session with the destination server [Grantges, handshaking, col 6 lines 37-67];

- (b) redirecting network communications, including the steps of:

redirecting the handshaking packets by rewriting the destination address in the handshaking packets IP headers to route the packets to an access

controlling web server that is remote from the client, the gateway, and the destination server [Grantges, handshaking, col 6 lines 37-67];

receiving a content request packet from the client machine at the gateway destined for the destination server intended to retrieve the desired resource from the destination server [Grantges, the destination servers, col 7 lines 1-8];

at the gateway redirecting the content request packet by rewriting the destination address in the packet IP header to route the packet to the access control web server [Grantges, a gateway proxy server and web server, Fig 1. It was obvious the proxy means redirect the IP address of header to route the packet to access control server or authorization server];

(c) receiving a response at the gateway from the access controlling web server [Grange, Fig 1]; and

(d) at the gateway, controlling access of the client machine to the desired resource based on the response from the access controlling web server, including refusing the client machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should not have access to the desired resource and granting the client machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should have access to the desired resource [Grantges, gateway 38 and authorization server 46, Fig 1].

3. Claims 17 and 33 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1.

Therefore, claims 17,33 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim1.

4. As per claims 2,18 Grantges discloses establishing a connection between the client machine and the destination server if the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable [Grantges, the authorization server 46, Fig 1].

5. As per claims 3,19 Grantges discloses the content request packet comprises a GET URL packet [Grantges URL, col 8 lines 15-28, col 10 lines 33-54].

6. As per claims 4,20 Grantges discloses the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable if the access controlling web server does not recognize the URL of the GET URL packet as an inherent feature of authorization server.

7. As per claims 5,21 Grantges discloses the step of refusing a connection to the destination server, and establishing instead a connection between the client machine and the access controlling web server if the response is that the access controlling web server recognizes the URL of the GET LTRL packet as an inherent feature of authorization server.

8. As per claims 6,13,22,29 Grantges discloses resending the handshaking packets and GET URL packet to the destination server transparently with respect to the client machine [Grantges, col 12 lines 36-45].

Art Unit: 2142

9. As per claims 8,15,24,31 Grantges discloses the step of determining whether to redirect network communications based on the content of a handshaking packet as inherent feature of communication between gateway and authorization server.

10. As per claims 9,16,25,32 Grantges discloses the step of determining whether to redirect network communications comprises deciding to redirect network communications if the handshaking packet is a SYN packet directed to port 80 on the destination server as inherent feature of communication between gateway and authorization server.

11. As per claims 10,26 Grantges discloses the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable if the access controlling web server recognizes the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of communication between gateway and authorization server.

12. As per claims 11,27 Grantges discloses the step of refusing a connection to the destination server, and establishing instead a connection between the client machine and the access controlling web server if the response indicates that the access controlling web server does not recognize the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of authorization server process.

13. As per claims 12,28 Grantges discloses the access controlling web server is an RSACi Web Server as inherent feature of Web server.

14. As per claims 7,14,23,30 Grantges discloses the invention as describe above except embedding an identity token readable by the access controlling web server in the GET URL packet, wherein the identity token uniquely identifies the client machine [Grantges, user ID information, col 11 lines 60-63].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Elgressy et al [Elgressy 6,336,140 B1] in view of Short et al [Short 6,636,894 B1].

15. As per claim 1, Elgressy discloses a method of controlling at a gateway computing device access of a client machine to a desired resource hosted on a destination server, the desired resource being of at least one material type selected from the group including audible materials, readable materials and viewable materials [Elgressy, a client communicates to web server via gateway, abstract. It was obvious the internet provides video/ audio/text data],

Art Unit: 2142

(a) at the gateway computing device receiving handshaking packets from the client machine intended to begin a session with the destination server [Elgressy , handshaking, col 5 lines 21-33];

(c) receiving a response at the gateway from the access controlling web server [Elgressy, handshaking, col 5 lines 21-33]; and

(d) at the gateway, controlling access of the client machine to the desired resource based on the response from the access controlling web server, including refusing the client machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should not have access to the desired resource and granting the client machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should have access to the desired resource [Elgressy, the gateway receives a signal from the checker indicating that the header is forbidden by security policy, col 5 line 50-col 6 line 18]

However Elgressy does not details (b) redirecting network communications, including the steps of:

redirecting the handshaking packets by rewriting the destination address in the handshaking packets IP headers to route the packets to an access controlling web server that is remote from the client, the gateway, and the destination server;

receiving a content request packet from the client machine at the gateway destined for the destination server intended to retrieve the desired resource from the destination server;

at the gateway redirecting the content request packet by rewriting the destination address in the packet IP header to route the packet to the access control web server;

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the gateway services between clients/servers and found Short teaching. Short discloses a method for using an authorization server, which located within gateway, to redirect user request based on the user access right to the destination network [Short, abstract, col 5 lines 15-35,col 7 line 54-col 8 line 42]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of redirection the client request based on the user access right to the destination network as taught by Short into the Elgressy's apparatus in order to utilize the gateway on network. Doing so would enhance the security and provide a dynamic control access over the Internet.

16. Claims 17 and 33 contain the similar limitations set forth of method claim 1.

Therefore, claims 17,33 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim1.

17. As per claims 2,18 Elgressy-Short disclose establishing a connection between the client machine and the destination server if the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable as inherent feature of authorization server.

18. As per claims 3,19 Elgressy-Short disclose the content request packet comprises a GET URL packet [Elgressy, GET_ command, col 5 lines 21-43].

19. As per claims 4,20 Elgressy-Short disclose the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable if the access controlling web server does not recognize the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of authorization server.

20. As per claims 5,21 Elgressy-Short disclose the step of refusing a connection to the destination server, and establishing instead a connection between the client machine and the access controlling web server if the response is that the access controlling web server recognizes the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of authorization server.

21. As per claims 6,13,22,29 Elgressy-Short disclose resending the handshaking packets and GET URL packet to the destination server transparently with respect to the client machine [Elgressy, handshaking, col 5 lines 21-33].

Art Unit: 2142

22. As per claims 8,15,24,31 Elgressy-Short disclose the step of determining whether to redirect network communications based on the content of a handshaking packet as inherent feature of authorization server.

23. As per claims 9,16,25,32 Elgressy-Short disclose the step of determining whether to redirect network communications comprises deciding to redirect network communications if the handshaking packet is a SYN packet directed to port 80 on the destination server as inherent feature of authorization server.

24. As per claims 10,26 Elgressy-Short disclose the response indicates that access to the desired resource is allowable if the access controlling web server recognizes the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of authorization server.

25. As per claims 11,27 Elgressy-Short disclose the step of refusing a connection to the destination server, and establishing instead a connection between the client machine and the access controlling web server if the response indicates that the access controlling web server does not recognize the URL of the GET URL packet as inherent feature of authorization server.

26. As per claims 12,28 Elgressy-Short disclose the access controlling web server is an RSACi Web Server as inherent feature of Web server.

Art Unit: 2142

27. As per claims 7,14,23,30 Elgressy-Short disclose the invention as describe above except embedding an identity token readable by the access controlling web server in the GET URL packet, wherein the identity token uniquely identifies the client machine [Elgressy, checking a header to identify resources which permitted according to a security policy, col 8 lines 3-12].

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

